G. R. S. IX-5]

Previous references. 1895-96.

191 .

(L.R.)

Later references.

File No. 937 95

Serial Nos. 1 to 11

GENERAL AND REVENUE SECRETARIAT.

Serial Nos. 1 to 11.

~~Part~~ B for May 1899.

SUBJECT.

Appeal of Venkataramiah regarding a Hut Sanction of certain lands from his Inam during the Survey & Settlement &.

W D 1250—GPB—30,000 28-1-19

(9)

Petn no 17389 1895-96
A.S. 126

Petr — Shamboge Venkatramappa
Kurabalapalli
Bagepalli Taluk

Subject - Claim to 12 guntas of land & the 13 tamarind trees thereon, wh were alleged to have been wrongly measured into I no 6 wh is not petrs.

Last reference - Letter no 594 of 3/97 from the Survey Supt.

not found.

Petr represents that - at the Survey settlement in 1885-86 12 guntas of his Inam land (I no 30) with the trees thereon were excluded from I no 30 & included in I no 6 belonging to Base Reddi Sabba Raya & Venkappa and that wrong to his minority, he appealed against that order only in 1891 within 2 years of his attaining majority.

A report having been called for, the Survey Supt reported that the absence of any complaint

dummy other measurements
a Confirmation - the Statements
made by Pltff's at the
time of Settlement appeared
to them great doubts as
the pltff's Statements.

These papers were forwarded
to the Dy Commr to enquire
into pltff's plea & minority
and, if he found that plea
valid, to enquire into the
subject matter of the Claim

In reply, the Dy Commr reported
that from the evidence produced
he there was no reason to
disbelieve, pltff was a minor
till the 2nd 1889 & that he
in 1891 instituted the Complaint
within 2 years of his
attaining majority and that
his case was one falling
under Sec 118 of the Land Act Cap

As regards the subject matter
of the Claim, the Dy Commr
was of opinion that the claim
must be held to be moved on
the following grounds.

(a) That the old accounts of Siddanthi (1859-60) showed that Pet^{a} 1 no 30 (map no 84) contained 40 tamarind trees but that there were no trees of any kind either on S. no 6 (map no 124) or on any other adjoining no

(b) That of the 13 tamarind trees standing on S. no 6 according to the settlement records, one has been cut & the other 12 are 50 or 60 years old; a fact which excludes any hypothesis of the trees having come into existence subsequent to 1859-60.

The Dy Comm^{r}'s report having been forwarded to him he replied his remarks, that officer reports that from the careful enquiry instituted by the Dy Comm^{r}, sufficient cause had been shown to bring the case under sec^{n} 118 of the Land Rev Code and that the strip of land with the trees may be included in S. no 30 if adjoining it or be made into a separate no if otherwise.

The case is a contested
Comery under clause (c) (46) of
para 10 of the Rules of business

Also under (2)(b) of para 10,
the holder or holders of S. No 6
will have to be heard before
the ~~S.M.~~ settlement or village
papers can be altered.
"No order of a subordinate officer
shall be modified or reversed
without due notice of the hearing
of the case to the party whose interests
will thereby be affected").

Serial No 13 on file (A) gives a
Sketch of S Nos 6, 30 & surrounds
Nos & shows that the strip of
land in question can be added
on to S. No 30.

Sd/ for Ld Commissioner
26/3/97

R 2 11.30 Am
28/3/97

Post in the usual
course of business
Duly considered

28/3/97

29/3/97

Bring up for hearing
2/4/97

Posted to 14th June 1897 for hearing at Begore

Neither party is
present. The Supt
will depose as to
matter as proposed
by him in his letter
of
No
15.6.97

Bdle & ends drafted
2/4/97

13

Disputed portion now added as to
S. no 6, is shown in red dots.

22/12/16

Council Case
Sd. time -
Stamp insufficient (one Rupee 4 pies instead of Rs 2)
Sub 6 the Rev. Seer

L.R. 93-95-11

15/11

Nowt out Mrs
Defect C
15-11-95

Attended to.
Reg
18/11

20/11/95

28/11 Petr has made good the deficiency in Stamps.
Subd
A.S. 6/3/96

Sd C.B.C Councillor
C
7-3-96

A.S. 9/3/

Call for report
issued
10/3/96

Draft Opn
A.S. 11/3

C
11-3-96

R.W. 5.25. P.M.
drafted
12-3-96

1895

No. 1738

Name of Petitioner, Shanbogue Venkatramaiya

Village, Kurabalapalli

Taluk, Bagepalli

District, Kolar

Date of Arzi, 30-10-95

Date of Receipt, 11-11-95

Date of Disposal,

No. of Enclosure, 1-

ABSTRACT.

Appeals against the Survey Supt's decision regarding certain tamarind trees alleged to have been included in the Petr's Inam but said to have been separated during the Survey & Settlement.

The order appealed against is as follows:—

"It is a long time since the Survey and Settlement was made. It does not seem proper to listen to their complaints now. I think that it is impossible to establish that the trees were Inam. If it were a fact that the land under dispute

he cannot enter into A unless on production of an order I think, "we cannot interfere in the matter" N. 6/3/96
from a competent court (proper authority)"

Petitioner states that some tamarind trees together with the land on which they are situated ~~which~~ formed a portion of his Inam S. No 30 of the above village; that the same has been were taken out and annexed to S. No 6 dry land, in the joint Patta of Basi Reddi, SubbaRaya & Timmappa Dasarappa; that since he was a minor during the Survey Jamabandi he was not able to lodge a complaint; that Muddappa the then Shanbogue gumasta had stated in the accts that Govt waste and the Inam had been numbered together, this was not attended to by the Jamabandi officer; that since the trees land formed a were added to their annexed portion for the last 2 or 3 years, the Petr complained about it to the Holar Dy Supt on 26-11-96; that this being referred to the Sub-Dy officer of C. Ballapur he was informed that he should file a suit in the Revenue Court; that upon his appeal to the Dy Comr it was decided that the ~~trees~~ respondents viz: Basi Reddi, SubbaRaya & Timmappa had no right to the trees and land; but that the order was held in abeyance; and that finally the case coming into the knowledge of the Survey Supt, that officer was pleased to order that the Petr should not ~~act~~ into the land unless he produces an order from a ~~co~~ proper authority to the effect that the land belonged to the Petitioner together with the trees.

Petr appeals against this order —

BLR

1738

A.S. 120 of 1895-96.

Petition

21-3-96

Application for certificate of sale

30-10-95

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE
PETITION DEPARTMENT.
RECD. ON 29-3-96
DATE

3064

26-2-96

25-2-96

15-1-96

MYSORE DEWAN'S OFFICE.

PETITION DEPARTMENT.

L. R. 93-95-2

OFFICIAL MEMORANDUM.

The accompanying Appeal Petition

Registered No. 1738 / 3084 dated 30-10-95

received at the Dewan's Office from Shanbhog Venkataramiah, Kumbalapalli village, Bagepalli Dalul, appealing against the decision of the Survey Supdt regarding certain tamarind trees alleged to have been excluded from the Petitioner's share during the Survey Settlement

is forwarded, together with its ~~one~~ two enclosure, to the ~~Deputy Commissioner~~ Supdt of Revn Survey in ~~Mysore~~ District ~~of the~~ favour of

for a full report of the facts of the case and on the points urged in the petition.

2. The petition with its enclosure should be returned.

By order,

draft

12/3

for ~~Chief~~ Secretary.

BANGALORE,

12-3-1896

12.3.96

M.G.C.P.B.—25-4-95—1,000

(General Serial No. 30.)

13

189

From

To

The Chief Secretary to the Dewan Govt of Mysore.

Dated

Despatched 5th June 1896

Received

Enclosures No. 2 files of corres & one packet

General No. 1081
No.

In reply to Official Memorandum No pet 1694 of 12.3.96

SUBJECT.

Reporting upon certain Samanid trees said to have been excluded from Shanbogue Venkalaramiah's Inam Kucabacapalli village, Bagepalli Taluk during the survey - settlement

References (to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Sub. with reference to the Revenue Councillor's order on Rep. No 1738.

10/6/96

LR. 93-95-3

The Supt. Mysore Revenue Survey (3)

Send them papers to whom could he should be asked to enquire into the truth of the Petr's allegation that he was a minor at the time of the settlement & find out whether he has any legal claim to the inam compl. at this date of time. If he finds that in the affirmative then he should enquire into the question of the ownership of the trees & the land on which they stand and whether they form part of the Petr's inam holding.

10/6/96

10-6-96

Draft 12/6/96

Pet. 9132 JUN. 779 DEWAN'S OFFICE.

Subject with reference

P.A. Branch 6/6/96

Dbgl
1/2

Cp 1081

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 5th June 1896

To,

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore

Sir,

In reply to your Official Memorandum No Pet 1694 dated 12th March 1896 forwarding for full report Petition No. 1738 from Shanbog Venkataramiah Kurubadapalli ~~village~~ Bagepalli Taluk appealing against the decision of the Survey Department re-
-garding

=garding certain tamarind
trees alleged to have been ex=
cluded from the Petitioner's
Inam during the Survey
Settlement, I have the honor
to report as follows.

2 The Petitioners Inam
Survey No 30, the tamarind
trees are alleged to have been
measured into Survey No 6.

3 At the time of measure=
=ment Narsapa and Subraya
Jantidars of Survey No 6, Venkata
=ramiah the Petitioner and

the

the Shanbag (presumably Mudapa Gumasta) were present. No objection was made to the boundaries fixed.

4 No objection was made during the classification.

5 At Phut Pahani the whole of No 6 was entered as Government land and verified by signature by Gumasta Mudapa and Patel Aperaddi. But at time of testing the Pat Pahani Head Munshi Kappanna wrote a Shera to the effect that 13 Tamarind trees from Survey

No 30 had been included in Survey No 6. This Shera was endorsed by the Shanbog Mudapa only. The whole matter however came before Colonel Rutherfurd at Settlement and that Officer decided, on the evidence of all the villagers that the Tamarind trees had been planted by the father of Subbaya the Khatedar of Survey No 6, that Government and Inam land had not been included in Survey No 6.

6 The absence of any com=
=plaint during either measure
=ment or classification and the
statements of the villagers at
the time of Settlement appear
to me to throw great doubt
in the allegations of the
Petitioners.

7 I attach a file of
Vernacular correspondence
as per list.

I have the honor to be
Sir,
Your most obed.t Servant

Supt. Mysore Revenue
Survey

120-0-27
16-6-96

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore

(4)

Read:-

L.R. 93-95-4

Petition No. 1738 dated 30th October 1895, from Shanbhag Venkataramiah of Kurubakapalli ~~village~~, Bagepalli Taluk, appealing against the order of the Superintendent of Rev. Survey in Mysore, in the matter of his claim to certain tamarind trees alleged to have been excluded during the Survey Settlement, from the petitioner's Inam land No. 30 and included in the Survey No. 6 of the above village.

2. Letter No. 1081 dated 5th June 1896, from the Superintendent of Revenue Survey in Mysore, ~~reporting~~ submitting the records relating to the complaint ~~on the above~~, and stating that the petitioner Venkataramiah was present at the time of measurement

Shanbhag gave ~~the~~ Mudafe
made any
objected to the ~~fixing of~~
fixed, either then or during
boundaries ~~and to the~~
classification; and ~~and~~ that
the villagers had deposed
before Colonel Rutherford
at the settlement that
the tamarind trees had
been planted by the father
of one Subraya the Khaledar
of Survey No. 6, and that
Govt and Inam land
had not been included
in S.No. 6 as alleged
by the petitioners, and that
he doubts the allegations
of the petitioners.

10860-1 2157/16 Enc: 2 Ver: files as per fairist
Order thereon Pet: 2137 16/36 1 Sanc: Supts letter and
1 appl petn with 2 Encs.

These papers will be
~~the entire records~~
~~received from the Supdt~~
~~of Rev. Survey Belgaum~~
~~by and the petition are~~
forwarded to the Deputy
Commissioner of the
Uttara Kolar Dt, for

enquiring into the truth of
the ~~petitioners~~ allegations
in the appeal memo
that the Petitioner was a minor at
the time of the settlement
If the Dr Coroner finds that Petr had
~~and for finding out whether~~
~~whether the petitioner has~~
a ~~any~~ legal excuse to bring
this complaint at this
distance of time. he will
~~If the Deputy Coroner finds~~
~~this question in the affirm~~
~~affirmative, he is re-~~
next
~~quested to~~ enquire into
the question of the owner-
-ship of the trees and
the land on which they
stand i.e. ~~and~~ whether
they form part of the
petitioner's Inam holding
and submit his findings as early
as practicable

15/ 6-96
Secretary to Govt

12/6/96. 13/6

To. The Deputy Coroner
Kolar
~~Nelamangala~~ Dt with the
Appeal Petn, Survey Supdt's letter & memo
The Supdt Rev. Survey.

Noted in connection with
letter as being a memo
duration -

received only 2 Vernacular files for despatch.
16/6/96.

Gen. 31.]

1897

4670
Ref 430
15 JAN 97
COMMISSIONER'S OFFICE

From The Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District
(5)

To

The Secretary to the
Government ~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 9th
Despatched 15th } January 1897
Received

General No. 2666
No. 658

Enclosure No. 2 files

Submits the records connected with the case of Petitioner Shanbhog Venkataramaniah of Kurubarapalli Bagepalli Taluk with the observation that his claim has been established

---

...nbmitted with reference to ...
...evenue council's order on ...
...e Deputy Commr's Survey Supdt's letter ...
...o 1881 of 5-6-96.

L.R. 93-95-5

21/1/97

Subd to 2nd counsellor
M
23/1.

Recd 6.15 pm
23/1/97

Send the Dy Comrs
letter & the whole
record with Survey Supdt
for any remarks
he may feel in
clined to make
in this matter.
23.1.96 MLD

25-1-97

Note
Draft, docketed by Survey Supdt.
M
25/1

Dy Commr Supdt
D/ drafted
27/1/97 ll

P.S. Rao
16/1/97
MLD

Recd
19/1

Sub Dy Secretary.
20/1

Kolar Deputy Commissioner's
Dated the 9th January 1897

To the Secretary
to the Government of Mysore
Rev. & Genl. Departments.

Sir,

Adverting to the Government Proceedings No. 18860-1 P. 2137 dated 15th June 1896 forwarding for enquiry and report a petition from Shanbhog Venkatramanappa of Kurubarapalli Bagepalli Taluk appealing against the order of the Superintendent of Rev. Survey in the matter of his Claim to certain tamarind trees alleged to have been excluded during the survey settlement from the petitioners Inam land No. 30 and included in Survey No. 6 of the above Village, I have the honour to submit herewith as per accompanying Perist the records connected with the case.

2. It will be observed from the same that according to a horoscope the only evidence produced by the petitioner in support of his allegation that he was a minor at the time of the survey settlement he was born on the 5th "Sudha of Phalguna in the year Pramoduta (February or March 1872) and that his legal disability as a minor ceased in the month of Phalguna of the year Virodhi (1889-90) while the settlement took place in 1885-86.

3. The petitioner complained to the Dy. Commissioner for the first time in the matter on the 21st December 1891 or within two years from the date of the expiry of the period of his minority, granting that his case is one falling within the scope of Section 118 of the Mysore Land Revenue Code.

This

4. His Complaint was referred to the Sub Division Officer Chick Ballapur for disposal and that Officer by an order dated 28th August 1892 referred the petitioner to a regular Revenue Suit.

5. Against this order the petitioner appealed to the Deputy Commissioner who after the necessary enquiry and reference to the Survey Superintendent communicated to the petitioner the latter Officer's order now under appeal (vide endorsement no. 13 dated 21st August 1895 granted to the petitioner by the Amildar of Bagepalli Taluq)

6. In the absence of any reason to question the genuineness of the horoscope produced by the petitioner, it may be presumed that he was a minor at the time of the settlement and attained age within 2 years of his Complaint

7. Now turning to the subject matter of the appeal I beg to state that the old account of Sidhartè (1859-60) shews that the petitioner's Survey no. 30 which bore magi no. 84 contained inter alia 40 tamarind trees but that there were no trees of any kind either on survey no. 6 (old no. 124) or on any other no. adjoining the latter.

8. According to the settlement records Survey no. 30 contained 21 tamarind trees and no. 6 thirteen while the adjoining numbers 7 and 31 had one neem tree and one tamarind tree standing on them respectively

9. One of the thirteen tamarind trees standing on Survey no. 6 seems to have since been cut and removed by the present occupants of the land and the remaining 12 are reported to be 50 or 60 years old, a fact which excludes any hypothesis of the trees having come into existence subsequent to the year Sidhartè

10. Under the foregoing circumstances I am inclined to think that the petitioner's

Claim

claim to the trees in question as well
to the land (about 12 guntas) on which
they stand has been established and
that they were by mistake measured
with survey no 6 during the survey settlement

11. The error appears to have been
discovered at the time and a chick
Patti submitted by the Taluk authorities
in March 1885 for needful rectification
but the settling officer Col. Rutherford
considered that no alteration was
called for as the villagers had stated
that the trees under notice had been
planted by the father of Subbiah one
of the occupants of the Survey no 6

12. The enclosures of the
Government Proceedings under reply
are herewith returned.

J M Kirshnaiengar

For Deputy Commissioner
Kolar District

Compd. port.

(6)

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

From The Secretary to the Govt. Mysore

L.R. 93-95-6

To The Superintendent of Rev: Survey Mysore.

Dated 27th January 97

Despatched

Received

General No. 6718

P. No. 1194

Enclosure No. 2 fols on letter & checked sch

Has the honor to forward herewith in original, letter No. 2666/658 of the 9th Inst. from the deputy Commissioner Kolar District, together with its enclosures the two files of Revenue records, for favour of any remarks he may be inclined to make in this matter.

(to be returned with the two Revenue files.)

By order

M

for Secretary

Draft

GG

Commr's order on the report by Commr's letter No. 2666/658 of 9.4.97

11/3/97

L.R. 93-95-7

Gen. Serial No. 30.]

5864

Pet 545-

189 7

MAR 97

DEWAN'S O

(7)

From

The Supt Mysore Revenue Survey

To

The ~~Chief~~ Secretary to the Govt
~~Dewan~~ of Mysore.

Dated 5th March 1897

Despatched

Received

Enclosures No. one letter and two files

General No. 594
No.

In reply to Secretary's docket No 6718 P1194 of 27.1.97

SUBJECT.

Submitting remarks in the matter of Shanbag Venkataramaniah's claim to certain tamarind trees on his Inam land No 6 in the Kudarapalli Village Basepalli Hobli

References—(to be entered only in the Dewan's Office).

Petition A
9/3/97

Rep put up
AR 11/3

(215)

No 5-94

Survey Superintendent's Office
Bangalore 5th March 1897

To

The Secretary to the
Government of Mysore
Rev & Gl Departts

Sir,

In reply to your Docket
No. 6718 dated 27th January
P. 1194
1897 I have the honor to state
that the case as against the
claim of Shanbag Venkata
=ramanaih of Kumbarpalli
to 12 Guntas of land out of
Survey No 6 with the trees stand
=ing thereon was stated in my
letter No. 108 of the 5th June 1896
The Deputy Commissioner has
now made a very careful
enquiry

GOVERNMENT OF INDIA

enquiry into the case now
under reference and has elici
-ted that the Mauzi No 124 (now
Survey No 6) contained, ac=
=cording to the accounts of
Siddharti (1859-60), no trees
of any kind, and that from
the age of the trees they could
not possibly have come into
existence subsequent to
Siddharti. The evidence
thus afforded must take
precedence of the oral testi=
=mony of the villagers before
Colonel Rutherfurd especially
as the Shanbag at the time
was

was a Minor

2 I think sufficient cause has been shown to bring the case under Section 118 of the Land Revenue Code.

3 It should be ascertained whether the 12 guntas now to be confirmed to Shanbag Venkataramanaiah adjoin Survey No 30; if they do they should be included in that number.

4 The two files of Vernacular records received with the above under reply are herewith &c.

-turned. 81

I have the honor to be
Sir
Your most obed. Servant
J. Lunt
Supt. Mysore Rev. Survey

GOVERNMENT OF MYSORE

Proceedings of the Govt of Mysore.

L. R. 93-95-8

Read:-

(1) Petition of appeal No 120 of 1895-96 presented by Shanbhog Venkataramaiya of Kurubara-palli, Bagepalli Taluk, against the order of the Supdt of Revenue Survey, rejecting, as out-of-time, the Petitioner's complaint that at the Survey settlement in 1885-86, 12 guntas of his Inam land (Survey No 30) with the tamarind trees thereon were excluded from his holding and included in Survey No 6 belonging to Basi Reddi Subraya and Timmappa.

(2) Letter No 1081 dated 5th June 1896 from the Supdt Revenue Survey, stating that the absence of any complaint during either measure-ment

of identification, and the state-
ments of the villagers at the time of settlement
appeared to throw great
doubt on the Petitioner's allegations.

(3) Govt Proc No 10860-1 / Pet. 2137
dated 15th June 1896, directing
the Deputy Commr of Kolar
to inquire into the truth of the
allegation in the appeal memo
that the Petr was a minor at
the time of the settlement, and
to enquire into the subject-
matter of the claim if it
was found that the Petr had
a legal excuse to bring the
complaint at such a distance
of time.

(4) Letter No 2666/658 dated 9th
January 1897 from the Deputy
Commr Kolar District, reporting
that in the absence of any
reason to question the genuineness
of the horoscope produced by
the Petitioner, it might be presumed
that he was a minor at the

time

time of the Settlement- and attained majority within 2 years of the date of his Complaint-, that the old accounts of 1859-60 showed that the Petitioner's land Survey No 30, which bore Maji No 84 contained 40 tamarind trees but there were no trees either on Survey No 6 (Maji No 124) or on any other adjoining land, that of the 13 tamarind trees standing on S. No 6, according to the Settlement-records, one was cut- and the other 12 were 50 or 60 years old, a fact which excluded any hypothesis of the trees having come into existence subsequent- to 1859-60, and that therefore he was inclined to think that the Petitioner's claim was established.

(5) Letter No 5-94 dated 5th March 1897, from the Supdt. Revenue Survey, stating with reference to the above letter of the Dy Commr, that from the

careful enquiry instituted by the latter officer, sufficient cause had been shown to bring the case under Section 118 of the Land Revenue Code, and that the 12 guntas of land now to be confirmed to Shanbhog Venkatramaiya should be included in his land S. No 30, if it ~~was~~ adjoined ~~his land was~~ number.

— 2 —

(40) Order thereon. Rs $\frac{494-95}{P.73-97}$ 8 ~~12~~ 14 7.97 Encl 2 V. fds

Neither party was present at the time of hearing, though notices had been duly served. The Survey Superintendent will dispose of this matter as proposed by him in his letter No. 594 dated 5th March 1897.

Sd/ [illegible] underlined in pencil has been added

Draft C.2,3

For Secretary 12.7.97

To The Supdt, Mysore Rev: Survey with records.

" Deputy Commr, Kolar District

X ಸಹಿ ಆದೇಶದ ಪ್ರತಿ 14-7-97 ಸಹಿ ಎಂ.ಎಸ್

4.5.99.

Ver Records for perfect.

L.R. 93-95-10

1899

No. 1751.

Name of Petitioner Venkatā ramiah Shanbhog of

Village Jurumchalli.

Taluk Bagepalli.

District Kolar.

Date of Arzi 28-2-99

Date of Receipt 2-5-99.

Date of Disposal

No. of Enclosure one.

4/5/99

30-10-95 1738 12-7-97 14 494-95 P. F. 3-97

5/5/99

O 7 of 97 relating to the appeal of Venkatramiah is put up

ABSTRACT

States that according to Govt. Endt. No. 1738 of 12-7-97, the land was phoded by the Survey Supdt. order, & the trees together with the land below them was joined to his inamti; that though he has been paying kandaya for the trees since the year Kilambi, Suba Rao & others of the village are taking the produce of the trees; that they being asked by the Sheikdar & the Shanbhog amildar, they have given

8/5/99

Subd.

Petr. claims loss of previous years income from the tamarind trees and prevention of the opponents from interfering with the trees, both of which are out of place in a Revenue Court.

9/5/99

He may be told that, in order to redress the grievances complained of by him, he should follow the procedure prescribed by law and that Govt: cannot interfere in the matters BR 6/5/99.

8/5/99

belong to them, & that they would not leave these, as they have been enjoying the same, even after the introduction of the Survey Settlement, by paying Kan-dayam; that as far as the Petnr knows they have been enjoying the ~~land~~ trees since his father's death, ie since the year 6 Srimukha; that the annual produce of the trees amount to Rs 50 & the two trees that are cut down, cost Rs 200.

Prays that his loss since the time of his father's death may be made good from Govt or from Suba Rao & others; that they be ordered not to trouble him anymore & that they be punished for disobeying Govt orders.

Copy of
Enc. 1 in Govt Endt
No. 1738 of 12-7-97.

SM
7/8/97

Reg. No. 1757
2-5-99

2.5.99

ಪರಮಾನಂದ ಸ್ವಾಮಿಗಳವರ ಸನ್ನಿಧಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ಸಲ್ಲಿಸಿದ ಅರ್ಜಿ

ಮಾನ್ಯರೆ,

ಸಂಸ್ಥಾನದ ಸೇವೆ

ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕು ಕಛೇರಿಯಲ್ಲಿ ದಿನಾಂಕ 28-2-99 ರಂದು ಬೆಳಿಗ್ಗೆ 10 ಗಂಟೆಗೆ ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ ತಾಲ್ಲೂಕಿನ ಕಾಲಿಕಾಪುರ ಗ್ರಾಮದ ಸರ್ವೆ ನಂಬರ್ 50 ರಲ್ಲಿ ಒಟ್ಟು 2 ಎಕರೆ 20 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನಿನ ಪೈಕಿ ಪೂರ್ವ ಭಾಗದಲ್ಲಿ 1 ಎಕರೆ 10 ಗುಂಟೆ ಜಮೀನನ್ನು ಸಾರ್ವಜನಿಕ ಹರಾಜಿನ ಮೂಲಕ ಮಾರಾಟ ಮಾಡಲಾಗುವುದು. ಆಸಕ್ತರು ಹಾಜರಿರಬೇಕು.

ತಹಶೀಲ್ದಾರರು, ಸಾಲಿಗ್ರಾಮ

L.R. 93-95-11

By order

for Sekretary